

Serial No. 09/228,562
November 3, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated June 5, 2003
Page 6 of 9

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kobayashi (JP 52-50605). Claims 2-8 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi in view of Lopez et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,132,647). Claims 9-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi in view of Kato et al. (U.S. 5,140,497). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 1-21.

Claim 1 recites:

"An input-output balanced filter comprising:
first and second input terminals and first and second output terminals;

a first LC filter circuit unit including a common side line, said first LC filter circuit unit being connected between said first input terminal and said first output terminal;

a second LC filter circuit unit including a common side line, said second LC filter circuit unit being connected between said second input terminal and said second output terminal;

a common line defined by an element that is independent of said first LC filter circuit unit and said second LC filter circuit unit;

wherein said common side line of said first LC filter circuit unit is electrically and directly connected to said common side line of said second LC filter circuit unit via said common line; and

an approximate midpoint of said common line is defined as a common phase reference point of each of said first and second LC filter circuit units." (emphasis added)

Applicants' claim 1 recites the features of "a common line defined by an element that is independent of said first LC filter circuit unit and said second LC filter circuit unit" and "an approximate midpoint of said common line is defined as a common phase reference point of each of said first and second LC filter circuit units." Applicants' claims 11 and 21 recite features which are similar to the features recited in Applicants' claim 1, including the above emphasized features. With the Improved features of claims 1, 11, and 21, Applicants have been able to provide an input-output balanced filter which has a

Serial No. 09/228,562
November 3, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated June 5, 2003
Page 7 of 9

greatly reduced size and extremely stable electrical characteristics (see, for example, the first full paragraph on page 2 of the originally filed Specification).

First, the Examiner has alleged in paragraph no. 2 on page 2 and in paragraph no. 9 on page 13 of the outstanding Office Action that Kobayashi teaches a first LC filter (L6, L7, C8, and C9), a second LC filter (L9, L10, C10, and C11), and a common line defined by element L8. The Examiner has failed to provide any evidence that the circuit defined by elements L6, L7, C8, and C9 and the circuit defined by L9, L10, C10, and C11 function as LC filter circuits. In fact, lines 4-6 of page 2 of the English translation of Kobayashi provided to the Examiner with the Supplemental Request for Reconsideration filed on March 17, 2003 state that "[c]apacitors C8 to C11 and coils L6 to L10 constitute a high-pass filter for blocking an intermediate frequency component" (emphasis added). That is, contrary to the Examiner's allegations, Kobayashi teaches that coil L8 is an integral component of the high-pass filter shown in Fig. 5, and thus, cannot be fairly construed as "a common line defined by an element that is independent of said first LC filter circuit unit and said second LC filter circuit unit" (emphasis added) as recited in Applicants' claim 1 and similarly in Applicants' claims 11 and 21.

Second, as argued in the previous Amendment dated February 19, 2003, the Examiner has failed to provide any evidence that Kobayashi teaches or suggests the feature of "an approximate midpoint of said common line is defined as a common phase reference point of each of said first and second LC filter circuit units" as recited in Applicants' claim 1 and similarly in Applicants' claims 11 and 21. The Examiner has alleged in paragraph no. 2 on page 3 and in paragraph no. 6 on page 13 of the outstanding Office Action that because the circuit illustrated in Fig. 5 of Kobayashi has the same structural arrangement as the claimed invention, the circuit would inherently perform the same and have the same effects as the present claimed invention. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As noted above, Kobayashi clearly fails to teach or suggest the same structural arrangement as the present claimed invention because Kobayashi fails to teach or

Serial No. 09/228,562
November 3, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated June 5, 2003
Page 8 of 9

suggest the claimed feature of "a common line defined by an element that is independent of said first LC filter circuit unit and said second LC filter circuit unit" as recited in Applicants' claim 1 and similarly in Applicants' claims 11 and 21. Thus, Kobayashi clearly does not inherently teach or suggest the feature of "an approximate midpoint of said common line is defined as a common phase reference point of each of said first and second LC filter circuit units" as recited in Applicants' claim 1 and similarly in Applicants' claims 11 and 21.

The Examiner has relied upon Lopez and Kato et al. to cure various deficiencies in Kobayashi. However, neither Lopez nor Kato et al. teaches or suggest the features of "a common line defined by an element that is independent of said first LC filter circuit unit and said second LC filter circuit unit" and "an approximate midpoint of said common line is defined as a common phase reference point of each of said first and second LC filter circuit units" as recited in Applicants' claim 1 and similarly in Applicants' claims 11 and 21.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kobayashi, the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi in view of Kato et al., and the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi in view of Lopez et al.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Kobayashi, Lopez, and Kato et al., applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in claim 1, 11, and 21 of the present application. Claims 2-10 depend upon claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Claims 12-20 depend upon claim 11 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claim 11 is allowable.

MPEP 707.02 "Applications Up for Third Action and 5-year Application" sets forth that "the supervisory patent examiners are expected to personally check on the pendency of every application which is up for the third or subsequent official action with a view to finally concluding its prosecution. Any

Serial No. 09/228,562
November 3, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated June 5, 2003
Page 9 of 9

application that has been pending five years should be carefully studied by the supervisory patent examiner and every effort made to terminate its prosecution. In order to accomplish this result, the application is to be considered 'special' by the examiner." Since, the Examiner has issued three Office Actions and the present application has been pending for more than five years, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner make this application "special" and review this application with the SPE in order to expedite prosecution.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition the Commissioner for a TWO-month extension of time, extending to November 5, 2003, the period for response to the Office Action dated June 5, 2003.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 3, 2003


Attorneys for Applicants

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710

KEATING & BENNETT LLP
10400 Eaton Place, Suite 312
Fairfax, VA 22030
Telephone: (703) 385-5200
Facsimile: (703) 385-5080